

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 and 35-67 were pending. Claims 1-17, 35-64 and 67 have been allowed. Claims 18, 21-33, 65 and 66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims 18-33, 65 and 66 have been canceled. Claims 40, 41 and 54 have been amended. Claims 68-148 have been added. Consideration and allowance of Claims 68-148 is requested.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected Claims 18, 21-33, 65 and 66 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Cobbley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,614,940).

Claims 18, 21-33, 65 and 66 have been canceled, thereby obviating the rejection of those claims.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected Claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Cobbley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,614,940).

Claims 19 and 20 have been canceled, thereby obviating the rejection of those claims.

Amendment of Claims

Claims 40, 41 and 54 have been amended to correct informalities, such amendments not affecting the scope of those claims.

New Claims

Claims 68-148 have been added.

Claims 68-85 are method claims that are similar in content to previously allowed system claims 2-17, 63 and 64, and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as those claims.

Claims 86-103 are computer program claims that are similar in content to previously allowed system claims 2-17, 63 and 64, and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as those claims.

Claims 104-108 are computer program claims that are similar in content to previously allowed method claims 37-41, and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as those claims.

Claims 109-114 are system claims that are similar in content to previously allowed method claims 36-41, and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as those claims.

Claims 115-119 are computer program claims that are similar in content to previously allowed method claims 43-46 and 67, and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as those claims.

Claims 120-125 are system claims that are similar in content to previously allowed method claims 42-46 and 67, and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as those claims.

Claims 126-136 are computer program claims that are similar in content to previously allowed method claims 48-58, and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as those claims.

Claims 137-148 are system claims that are similar in content to previously allowed method claims 47-58, and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as those claims.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-33 and 35-67 were pending. Claims 1-17, 35-64 and 67 were allowed. Claims 18-33, 65 and 66 were rejected. Claims 40, 41 and 54 have been amended. Claims 18-33, 65 and 66 have been canceled. Claims 68-148 have been added. In view of the foregoing, it is requested that Claims 1-17, 35-64 and 67-148 be allowed. If the Examiner wishes to discuss any aspect of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' undersigned attorney at (408) 945-9912.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on February 20, 2001.

2-20-01 David R. Graham
Date Signature

Respectfully submitted,

David R. Graham

David R. Graham
Reg. No. 36,150
Attorney for Applicants